



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

these are not genuine, and that the rest have been extensively interpolated. This is a controversy, however, with which we need not meddle; for in all that has been ascribed to Ignatius there is not a word of any prayer or invocation being addressed to the Blessed Virgin.

In Ignatius, however, we do find the name of the Virgin Mary. In opposition to those who denied that our Lord was truly man, he asserts, in three or four places, that our Saviour was born of Mary (see Ephesians caps. 7, 18, Trallians cap. 9, Smyrna cap. 1.), but without any further ascription of glory to her. He also entertained a singular opinion that our Saviour was born of an espoused virgin, in order that his birth might remain unknown to the devil. See Ephesians, cap. 19—"Now the virginity of Mary, and her bringing forth, was kept in secret from the prince of this world, as well as the death of our Lord." Beyond these passages we find no further mention of the Virgin, and it will be seen that there is not a trace of a prayer or invocation addressed to her.

There is extant an epistle to the Philipians, by Polycarp, who died about 100 years after our Saviour's death, but he does not once mention the Virgin's name.

The acts of the martyrdom of both Ignatius and of Polycarp are equally silent as to the Virgin, nor did these martyrs think of addressing their dying prayers to any save our Lord.

Lastly, we have got a production of great antiquity, called "The Shepherd" of Hermas. Here, too, there is no mention of the Virgin of any kind. But this writer has very plainly declared to us what was the sole ground of his hope—

"If you wish to enter into any city, and the city be surrounded by a wall, and have but one gate, can you get into that city except by its gate? As, then, there can be no entrance into that city save by its gate, so is there no entrance into the kingdom of God except by the name of his Son." And again—"The gate is the Son of God, who is the sole access to God. None, therefore, shall enter to God but by his Son."

We have now laid before our readers the result of a search through the most ancient uninspired remains of Christian antiquity. These writings contain much on the duty of prayer, on the subject matter of our prayer, and the object of it: but this topic never appears to have suggested the Blessed Virgin to their minds, nor do they speak of any mediator but him whom St. Paul asserts to be the only mediator between God and man.

Now, what inference are we to draw from the silence of these Fathers? We have to thank a correspondent (see below) who, in a letter which has reached us since the foregoing was written, has given us our choice of several ways of accounting for it. We may say, with the first writer he cites, that they said so little about her, in hopes that their readers might think the more of her; or else, with Carthage, that the best way of commending her excellency was to say nothing about it. But for our own part we believe that Canisius has hit off the true account of the matter, and that they said nothing only because they knew nothing of doctrines which were not delivered in their time, and which, if revealed at all, were only revealed in later ages.

In our next number we shall proceed to the writers of the second century. We shall inquire whether any new revelations about the Virgin were made in their time, or whether any of them had more courage than the evangelists, and ventured to undertake a task, the greatness and difficulty of which, according to Aloysius Novarinus, deterred the sacred writers from meddling with it.

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I am surprised that you should have published an article showing how little the Bible tells of the life of the Blessed Virgin, without having noticed at the same time the answers that eminent Roman Catholic divines have given to such statements. Did it never strike you that a fact so notorious as the silence of Scripture about the Blessed Virgin, must have engaged the attention of learned Roman Catholics, and that they must have accounted for it? And would it not have been fair to have inquired how they accounted for it, instead of following the too common plan of everlastingly repeating the same old objections, without ever noticing the answers that have been given to them a hundred times over?

The Scriptures, you say, tell us little or nothing about the Blessed Virgin; they are wholly silent about her from the time of our Lord's ascension. Quite true, sir; but learned Roman Catholics have noticed that fact as well as you, and have accounted for it, and shown its bearings; and I call upon you, if you are really actuated by the spirit of fair play which you profess, to give their answers, which I here subjoin.

The learned author of the Pomarium says:—This omission "was to excite the devotion of the faithful more towards her, that they might more greedily inquire after her actions, her life and death."

Aloysius Novarinus says:—"I believe the evangelists, being oppressed with the greatness and difficulty of the thing, abstained from meddling with that which by no labour or skill of theirs they could perform: wherefore, like skilful painters, they drew a veil, that under the covering and shade of silence, we might conjecture the more concerning her, because they had expressed nothing."—*Umbra Virginis*, p. 58.

Canisius, a man of vast learning, and one of the founders of the Jesuits, companion in the vast undertaking of the illustrious Ignatius, founder of that order, says:—"It is a heinous error to deny at this time so many things concerning Mary and her dignity, which, though not taken notice of in the Scriptures, nor presently delivered in the time of the apostles, yet have been revealed by God to the later ages as certain, and at length recommended as such by the church."—*Lib. 4, de Deip.*, c. 22.

Poza says:—"By this silence we are told that there is nothing written in the gospels, nothing in the law and prophets, which does not, after a manner, appertain to Mary."—*Elucidar. Liber. 2, tract 7, c. 1.*

And again—"If you would comprise, in short, what is more largely diffused in Scripture, know that Mary is the sum and brief of them all."—*Ibid.*, Tract 6, c. 1.

Carthage—"It is a contrivance of the Divine wisdom; because this silence does commend her excellency more fully than the most eloquent tongue can do."—*De Arcan. Deip.*, L. 2, Hom. 2.

Suarez—"Christ being known, and his faith enough established, her excellencies could not be unknown or hid."—*Præfat ad Tom. 2, in 3 partem.*

Sherlog, the Jesuit—"It was necessary for us to know that Mary was the mother of Christ. This the evangelists sufficiently declared, and this her honour being manifested, the rest might be collected therefrom, though they said no more."—*Antolog. 3, in Cantic.*, p. 142.

Gregorius Gallicanus—"The field of her praises is wide and immense, and therefore God would leave every man at liberty to say of her what he pleased."—*Marial*, p. 3.

Doubtless, sir, you thought you had made a great and most original discovery, that the Bible tells us little or nothing about the Blessed Virgin. Yet you see it is no more than Roman Catholic divines have known for some hundred years! And they see in the fact an argument exactly opposite to what you see in it. They think that the less the evangelists have told us about Mary, the more they intended that we should know about her. And was it not your duty to have known and stated their answer to your argument?

ONE WHO LOVES TO HEAR BOTH SIDES.

We readily insert our correspondent's letter; and if any other answers or explanations from eminent Roman Catholic divines should be sent to us, we will, of course, publish them.

We admit that the authors cited in the above letter are, some of them at least, among the most eminent in the Roman Catholic Church. We have only one further observation to make on them—if Roman Catholic divines approve so highly of the silence which the evangelists and apostles observed about Mary, if they think it so much for her honour, why do they not follow that example, and say as little about her themselves?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

DEAR SIR—In your very excellent article, "What Scripture tells us of the Virgin Mary," you quote John ii., from the Rhemish version—"What is it to me and to thee?" Now, Holy Scripture does not tell us that, but conveys a rebuke—"What have I to do with thee?" That this is the true rendering here, the enclosed fourteen quotations will, I think, prove, even to Roman Catholics, as the same original is in all these cases, and the same Vulgate, the Rhemish agreeing with them and us in thirteen out of the fourteen; and then, to support their system of Mariolatry, deviating from all. If the Rhemish be right in the fourteenth case, it must be wrong in the other thirteen, or vice versa, if the Douay and Rhemish be right in agreeing with the original and all versions in the thirteen cases, it must surely be wrong in deviating from all in the fourteenth.—Yours, faithfully,

GEORGE H. READE, *Inniskeen Rectory.*

JUDGES xi. 12.

Original.....	מה לי ואלך
Septuagint version	τι μοι και σοι.
Vulgate do.	quid mihi et tibi.
Douay do.	what hast thou to do with me.
Authorized do. ...	what hast thou to do with me.

2 SAMUEL (2 Kings) xvi. 10.

Original.....	מה לי ואלכ
Septuagint.....	τι μοι και εμιν.
Vulgate.....	quid mihi et vobis.
Douay.....	what have I to do with you.
Authorized.....	what have I to do with you.

EZRA (Esdras) iv. 3.

Original.....	לא לכם ולא
Septuagint.....	ουχ ημιν και υμιν.
Vulgate.....	non est nobis et vobis.
Douay.....	you have nothing to do with us.
Authorized.....	ye have nothing to do with us.

MATTHEW viii. 29.

Original.....	τι ημιν και σοι.
Vulgate.....	quid nobis tecum.
Rhemish.....	what have we to do with thee.
Authorized.....	what have we to do with thee.

Syriac Peschito... ܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ

considered nearly of equal authority with Greek.

JOEL iii. 4.

Original.....	מה אתם לי
Septuagint.....	τι υμεις εμοι (MS. Alex. και).
Vulgate.....	quid mihi et vobis.
Douay.....	what have ye to do with me.
Authorized.....	what have ye to do with me.

JOSHUA xxii. 24.

Original.....	מה לכם יהוה
Septuagint.....	τι υμιν και κυριω.
Vulgate.....	quid vobis et Domino.
Douay.....	what have you to do with the Lord.
Authorized.....	what have ye to do with the Lord.

2 SAMUEL xix. 22.

Original.....	מה לי ואלכ
Septuagint.....	τι εμοι και υμιν.
Vulgate.....	quid mihi et vobis.
Douay.....	What have I to do with you.
Authorized.....	What have I to do with you.

1 KINGS (iii), 17, 18.

Original.....	מה לי ואלך
Septuagint.....	τι εμοι και σοι.
Vulgate.....	quid mihi et tibi.
Douay.....	What have I to do with thee.
Authorized.....	What have I to do with thee.

2 KINGS (iv.) 3, 13.

Original.....	מה לי ואלך
Septuagint.....	τι εμοι και σοι.
Vulgate.....	quid mihi et tibi.
Douay.....	What have I to do with thee.
Authorized.....	What have I to do with thee.

LUKE viii. 28.

Original.....	τι εμοι και σοι.
Vulgate	quid mihi et tibi.
Rhemish.....	What have I to do with thee.
Authorized.....	What have I to do with thee.

MARK v. 7.

Original.....	τι εμοι και σοι.
Vulgate.....	quid mihi tecum.
Rhemish.....	What have I to do with thee.
Authorized.....	What have I to do with thee.

MARK i. 24.

Original.....	τι ημιν και σοι.
Vulgate.....	quid nobis tecum.
Rhemish.....	what have we to do with thee.
Authorized.....	what have we to do with thee.

LUKE iv. 34.

Original.....	τι ημιν και σοι.
Vulgate.....	quid nobis et tibi.
Rhemish.....	what have we to do with thee.
Authorized.....	what have we to do with thee.

JOHN ii. 4.

Original.....	τι εμοι και σοι.
Vulgate.....	quid mihi et tibi.
Rhemish.....	what is it to me and to thee!!
Authorized.....	what have I to do with thee.

Inniskeen, 18th Sept., 1852.